

REMARKS

Applicant wishes to express his appreciation for the telephone interview with the Examiner on December 16, 2004. The prior art and the claims were discussed; specifically the Weller reference was discussed with regard to Claim 1 of the application while indefiniteness in some of the language of Claim 19 was reviewed. Accordingly, applicant has amended Claim 1 to include a limitation directed to the “distal end of the pin shaft having a larger diameter than the reduced diameter end section of the bore”. This limitation distinguishes over Weller. A similar limitation has been incorporated in independent Claims 12 and 18.

Claim 19 was amended to make the language relating to the different taper angles of the tapered end section of the pin shaft and the taper section of the bore clearer. Original paragraph (d) was eliminated as redundant in view of the new language and paragraph (c) has been added to provide a clear and antecedent basis for the term “slots” recited later in the claim.

Claim 22 has been canceled.

Independent Claims 19, 23, 24 and 26 include the limitations directed to the locking of the screw set pin in the bore of the bolt. This locking is not just locking the bolt in a bolt hole, but locking the pin within the bore of the bolt. Figuratively, “locking the lock”. This feature is important and is believed to provide vibration loosening resistance to the recited structure. No references of which applicant is aware provide a means for locking a pin or screw set pin within

the bore of the corresponding locking bolt.

Claim 27 has been added and recites the limitation of the structure of the bore midsection and the pin shaft. The specific recitation of the threadless nature of these features is shown in the figures and clearly is not shown in reference to Weller. While Liljeberg may have a threadless shank, he requires the taper angles of the bore and the pin to be the same. However, all of applicants' claims incorporate the limitation that the angles be different; applicants' system will not operate if these angles are the same.

It is therefore respectfully submitted that the claims, as amended, are patentably distinguishable over the prior art and are in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

CAHILL, VON HELLENS & GLAZER P.L.C.



William C. Cahill
Registration No. 19,742

2141 East Highland Avenue
155 Park One
Phoenix, Arizona 85016
(602) 956-7000
Docket No. 6570-A-01